

1

2

3

4

5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Acer, Inc., NO. C 08-00877 JW
Plaintiff, NO. C 08-00882 JW
NO. C 08-05398 JW

**ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO
PROVIDE NOTICE RE. REASSIGNMENT
TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE GREWAL**

v.
Technology Properties Ltd, et al.,
Defendants.

HTC Corp.,
Plaintiff,

v.
Technology Properties Ltd, et al.,
Defendants.

Barco NV,
Plaintiff,

v.
Technology Properties Ltd, et al.,
Defendants.

On June 12, 2012, the Court issued its First Claim Construction Order in the above-captioned matters. (See Docket Item No. 336 in No. C 08-00877 JW.) In that Order, the Court informed the parties that, in light of its impending retirement, it proposed to assign this case to Magistrate Judge Grewal. (Id. at 22.) The Court instructed the parties to state “whether they jointly consent to having this case immediately reassigned to Judge Grewal,” and informed them that, in the event they do not

United States District Court


For the Northern District of California

1 jointly consent to the immediate reassignment, “the case will remain with Judge Ware and be subject
2 to reassignment in due course.” (Id.)

3 On July 2, 2012, the parties filed a Joint Statement in response to the Court’s First Claim
4 Construction Order. (See Docket Item No. 337 in No. C 08-00877 JW.) In that Joint Statement, the
5 parties stated that “[a]t this time, not all parties have agreed to consent to Magistrate Judge Grewal
6 for further proceedings.” (Id. at 3.) In particular, the Joint Statement informed the Court that
7 “Barco and HTC have not yet made a final determination but expect to have a decision soon.” (Id.)
8 However, the parties have not filed any subsequent statement informing the Court whether Barco
9 and HTC have agreed to consent to having this case reassigned to Judge Grewal.

10 Accordingly, and in order to resolve this issue prior to the Court’s retirement, the parties
11 shall file a Joint Statement on or before **August 6, 2012** indicating whether all parties consent to
12 having this case immediately reassigned to Judge Grewal. If all parties have not consented to the
13 reassignment to Judge Grewal by that date, the case will remain with Judge Ware and will be subject
14 to reassignment in due course.

15
16
17 Dated: August 2, 2012
18



JAMES WARE
United States District Chief Judge

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 Deepak Gupta dgupta@fbm.com
3 Eugene Y. Mar emar@fbm.com
3 Harold H. Davis harold.davis@klgates.com
4 James Carl Otteson jim@agilityiplaw.com
4 Jas S Dhillon jas.dhillon@klgates.com
Jeffrey M. Fisher jfisher@fbm.com
5 Jeffrey Michael Ratinoff jeffrey.ratinoff@klgates.com
John L. Cooper jcooper@fbm.com
6 Kyle Dakai Chen kyle.chen@cooley.com
Mark R. Weinstein mweinstein@cooley.com
7 Michelle Gail Breit mbreit@agilityiplaw.com
Nan E. Joesten njoesten@fbm.com
8 Paul A. Alsdorf palsdorf@fbm.com
Samuel Citron O'Rourke eupton@whitecase.com
9 Stephanie Powers Skaff sskaff@fbm.com
Timothy Paar Walker timothy.walker@klgates.com
10 William Sloan Coats william.coats@kayescholer.com

11 **Dated: August 2, 2012**

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

13 By: /s/ JW Chambers
14 William Noble
Courtroom Deputy

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28